

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 through 18 are pending in this application.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 through 4, 6 through 8, 10, 12, 15, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Yumibe *et al.* The Examiner has rejected Claims 5, 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Yumibe *et al.* and further in view of Schuder *et al.* The Examiner has rejected Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Yumibe and further in view of Broschard III *et al.* Applicant respectfully traverse these rejections.


Applicant's admitted prior art shows two pairs of traditional connectors 40 and 18 on the printed circuit board that connect with two pairs of traditional connectors 48 and 28 on a head disk assembly. Yumibe discloses the inventive connectors 14 and 26 shown in Figs. 4 and 6 of Applicant's disclosure. The Examiner contends in the final Office action (Paper No. 22) that "The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to optimize space utilization and minimize the space between the adjacent boards, as taught by Yumibe (see col. 1, lines 19-21, 40-45)." One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by Yumibe to replace both pairs of connectors in Figs. 1-3 with the inventive connector disclosed by Yumibe. Yumibe teaches away from using a conventional connector in addition to Yumibe's inventive connector. One of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to use both types of connector, the traditional connector and the

inventive connector as taught by Yumibe because of the cited passages by the Examiner to Yumibe. Thus, Applicant contends that if Yumibe was combined with Applicant's admitted prior art, both connector 18/28 and connector 14/26 would be the inventive novel type connector and there would be no 14 pin connector in the resulting product. For these reasons, Applicant traverses Examiner's rejection of Applicant's claims.

No fee is incurred by this Request.

In view of the foregoing remarks, all claims are deemed to be allowable and this application is believed to be in condition to be passed to issue. Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert E. Bushnell  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No.: 27,774

1522 "K" Street N.W., Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 408-9040

Folio: P54596  
Date: 4/17/00  
I.D.: REB/ML